APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,404	11/22/2006	Damien Mandy	979-133	9106

39600 7590 05/17/2010	EXAMINER
SOFER & HAROUN LLP.	ROBINSON BOYCE, AKIBA K
317 MADISON AVENUE, SUITE 910	
NEW YORK, NY 10017	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3628	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/17/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1.   Due to communications filed 2/1/10, the following is a final office action. Claims

1 has been amended. Claims 1-12 are pending in this application and have been

examined on the merits. The previous rejection has been adjusted to reflect claim

amendments and claims 1-12 are rejected as follows. .

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as
> set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be
> patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious
> at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said
> subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention
> was made.

3.   Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Silberberg (US 20030010821 A1), and further in view of Amirpanahi (US 5,648,906).

        As per claims 1, 10, Silberberg discloses:

receiving, at the payment system, a first payment from a user corresponding to a

first authorized parking time, ([0059], payment can be made by any of the other

methods previously referred to including credit card payment in which credit card details

are transmitted either automatically from the mobile phone or by the user keying

numbers into the mobile phone, or from a Smart Card or SIM Card associated with the

telephone 60 and which carries a cash balance which is reduced in accordance with the cost of the parking); and

supplying, by the payment system, to said user an extending code specific to said first payment, for extending parking time, ([0059], and once payment has been verified by the central station 50 the central station 50 transmits a code back to the telephone 60 which acts as a virtual receipt to indicate that parking has been paid for, where the code also acts as a code allowing entry into the parking station 100 when the user presents at the parking station 100, and also discloses that payment for the time required can be deducted from the user's account in the same manner as described with reference to Fig. 1, where in the embodiment of Fig. 1, payment is made in order to extend parking time as shown in [0052], thereby suggesting that the code can be used to extend parking time since the code is directly related to payment, and payment is used to extend parking time);

receiving, at the payment system, from said user a second payment corresponding to a second authorized parking time, ([0052], Silberberg discloses that the user can input a command by touching any key indicating that parking time should be extended and the central control station will deduct appropriate payment from the user's account and reactive the parking meter to show that additional parking time has been paid for);

Silberberg does not specifically disclose when receiving said second payment, said

payment system receiving said extending code specific to said first payment; and

automatically increasing, by said payment system, said second authorized parking time

by a residual authorized time corresponding to said first authorized parking time linked

to said first payment identified by said received extending code, however does disclose

a payment option where the user uses his telephone number to dial the central station

and the users account number is automatically deduced from the user's telephone

number as shown in [0048].

However, Amirpanahi discloses in col. 12, lines 32-56 that upon reinsertion of the

parking charge card into the magnetic strip reader the networked computerized parking

system credits the parking charge card with the unused amount of parking fee, and

identification information of the parking charge card is transferred to the central

database computer 90 upon insertion of the parking charge card into the card insertion

opening 68 so that any unused amount of parking fee is added back to the remaining,

unused value of the parking charge card, and the identification information is checked to

assure that any refund only goes back to the parking charge card originally entered into

the card insertion opening 68, i.e the code of the parking charge card entered for refund

matches with the code of the parking charge card originally entered for purchase of

parking time. Amirpanahi also shows that the central database computer 90 uses any

remaining, unused parking time and the appropriate parking rate to calculate the refund

to and calculate and retain a new value for the parking charge card in col. 12, lines 56-

61. In col. 1, lines 36-40 Amirpanahi also shows that is common to use cards for

computerized parking meters which operate without coins and to estimate a certain

value to be deducted from a card in order to compensate for the amount of time that the

user will be using said parking space, which further suggests that the new value for the

parking charge card in Amirpanahi compensates for a new amount of time that the user

will use the space, where examiner interprets the extending code related to the residual

authorized time, and corresponding to said first authorized parking time as the code of

the parking charge card entered for refund since it must be matched with the code of

the parking charge card originally entered for purchase of parking time in order for the

unused amount of parking fee to be added back to the remaining, unused value of the

parking charge card, so user can ultimately use this new value for authorizing additional

parking. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Silberberg and

Amirpanahi to disclose when receiving said second payment, said payment system

receiving said extending code specific to said first payment; and automatically

increasing, by said payment system, said second authorized parking time by a residual

authorized time corresponding to said first authorized parking time linked to said first

payment identified by said received extending code.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention to disclose when receiving said second payment, said payment

system receiving said extending code specific to said first payment; and automatically

increasing, by said payment system, said second authorized parking time by a residual

authorized time corresponding to said first authorized parking time linked to said first

payment identified by said received extending code with the motivation of showing that

a user is capable of using residual time in the form of remaining, unused parking time to

extend parking time.

As per claim 2, Silberberg discloses:

wherein the parking space is identified by a number and the user provides said

number during said second payment operation using the appropriate input and

processing means cooperating with said payment means, (Silberberg discloses that the

user can input a command by touching any key indicating that parking time should be

extended and the central control station will deduct appropriate payment from the user's

account and reactive the parking meter to show that additional parking time has been

paid for in [0052], where a unique code printed on the parking meter and is inputted into

the user's telephone to relay that data to the central station as shown in [0047])

As per claim 3, Silberberg discloses:

wherein said parking space number is used to generate said specific code

specific to said first payment, (Silberberg discloses a payment option where the user

uses his telephone number to dial the central station and the users account number is

automatically deduced from the user's telephone number as shown in [0048]).

As per claim 4, Silberberg foes not specifically disclose wherein said second

authorized parking time is increased by any residual time only if said first payment

relates to said parking space, however does disclose in [0052], that the user can input a command by touching any key indicating that parking time should be extended and the central control station will deduct appropriate payment from the user's account and reactive the parking meter to show that additional parking time has been paid for.

However, Amirpanahi discloses in col. 12, lines 32-56 that upon reinsertion of the parking charge card into the magnetic strip reader the networked computerized parking system credits the parking charge card with the unused amount of parking fee, and identification information of the parking charge card is transferred to the central database computer 90 upon insertion of the parking charge card into the card insertion opening 68 so that any unused amount of parking fee is added back to the remaining, unused value of the parking charge card, and the identification information is checked to assure that any refund only goes back to the parking charge card originally entered into the card insertion opening 68, i.e the code of the parking charge card entered for refund matches with the code of the parking charge card originally entered for purchase of parking time. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Silberberg and Amirpanahi to disclose wherein said second authorized parking time is increased by any residual time only if said first payment relates to said parking space.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention for said second authorized parking time to be increased by any residual time only if said first payment relates to said parking space with the motivation of showing that a user's is capable of using residual time to extend parking time.

As per claims 5, 6, 8 and 9, Silberberg foes not specifically disclose wherein said

first authorized parking time is increased by any residual time only if said first payment

relates to said parking space corresponding to a given amount paid by a user is equal to

the greater of the following times: the time directly related to said payment, as defined in

particular by an appropriate table of charges, and *any remaining authorized time*

corresponding to the previous authorized time relating to said parking space/ wherein

the authorized time is equal to the greater of the following times: the time directly related

to said first payment as defined by a table of charges and *any remaining authorized*

times corresponding to preceding authorized times relating to said parking space/

wherein said second authorized parking time after the user enters said code is equal to

the greater of the following times: the time directly related to said payment, as defined in

particular by a table of charges, plus any remaining authorized time corresponding to

the authorized time linked to said first payment, and any remaining authorized time

corresponding to the previous authorized time relating to said parking space of a

transaction preceding said first payment/wherein said second authorized parking time

after the user enters said code is equal to the greater of the following times: the time

directly related to said payment, as defined in particular by a table of charges, plus any

remaining authorized time corresponding to said first authorized parking time , and any

remaining authorized times corresponding to previous authorized times relating to said

parking space of transactions preceding said first payment, however does disclose in

[0052], that the user can input a command by touching any key indicating that parking

time should be extended and the central control station will deduct appropriate payment

from the user's account and reactive the parking meter to show that additional parking
time has been paid for.

However, Amirpanahi discloses in col. 12, lines 32-56 that upon reinsertion of the
parking charge card into the magnetic strip reader the networked computerized parking
system credits the parking charge card with the unused amount of parking fee, and
identification information of the parking charge card is transferred to the central
database computer 90 upon insertion of the parking charge card into the card insertion
opening 68 so that any unused amount of parking fee is added back to the remaining,
unused value of the parking charge card, and the identification information is checked to
assure that any refund only goes back to the parking charge card originally entered into
the card insertion opening 68, i.e the code of the parking charge card entered for refund
matches with the code of the parking charge card originally entered for purchase of
parking time. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Silberberg and
Amirpanahi to disclose wherein said first authorized parking time is increased by any
residual time only if said first payment relates to said parking space corresponding to a
given amount paid by a user is equal to the greater of the following times: the time
directly related to said payment, as defined in particular by an appropriate table of
charges, and *any remaining authorized time corresponding to the previous authorized
time relating to said parking space/* wherein the authorized time is equal to the greater
of the following times: the time directly related to said first payment as defined by a table
of charges and *any remaining authorized times corresponding to preceding authorized
times relating to said parking space/* wherein said second authorized parking time after

the user enters said code is equal to the greater of the following times: the time directly

related to said payment, as defined in particular by a table of charges, plus any

remaining authorized time corresponding to the authorized time linked to said first

payment, and any remaining authorized time corresponding to the previous authorized

time relating to said parking space of a transaction preceding said first payment/wherein

said second authorized parking time after the user enters said code is equal to the

greater of the following times: the time directly related to said payment, as defined in

particular by a table of charges, plus any remaining authorized time corresponding to

said first authorized parking time , and any remaining authorized times corresponding to

previous authorized times relating to said parking space of transactions preceding said

first payment.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention for wherein said first authorized parking time is increased by any

residual time only if said first payment relates to said parking space corresponding to a

given amount paid by a user is equal to the greater of the following times: the time

directly related to said payment, as defined in particular by an appropriate table of

charges, and *any remaining authorized time corresponding to the previous authorized

time relating to said parking space/* wherein the authorized time is equal to the greater

of the following times: the time directly related to said first payment as defined by a table

of charges and *any remaining authorized times corresponding to preceding authorized

times relating to said parking space/* wherein said second authorized parking time after

the user enters said code is equal to the greater of the following times: the time directly

related to said payment, as defined in particular by a table of charges, plus any

remaining authorized time corresponding to the authorized time linked to said first

payment, and any remaining authorized time corresponding to the previous authorized

time relating to said parking space of a transaction preceding said first payment/wherein

said second authorized parking time after the user enters said code is equal to the

greater of the following times: the time directly related to said payment, as defined in

particular by a table of charges, plus any remaining authorized time corresponding to

said first authorized parking time , and any remaining authorized times corresponding to

previous authorized times relating to said parking space of transactions preceding said

first payment with the motivation of showing that a user's is capable of using residual

time to extend parking time.

As per claim 7, Silberberg discloses:

only the time directly related to said first payment as defined in particular by said

table of charges is communicated to the user, (Silberberg shows that a central controller

can telephone the user's mobile telephone and display a message indicating that

parking time is almost expired and asking for acknowledgment as to whether the meter

should be topped up for a further payment period up to one hour which will be the

maximum parking time allowed at that meter in [0027]).

As per claims 11, 12, Silberberg does not specifically disclose wherein said user

makes said second payment before an expiry of time of said first authorized parking

time, and wherein the residual authorized parking time corresponds to the time between

the second payment and the expiry time of the first authorized parking time/ wherein the

code of said first payment is valid until an expiry of time of said first

authorized parking time, and wherein the residual authorized parking time corresponds

to the time between said second payment and the expiry time of said first authorized

parking time , however does disclose the user will be presented with a display indicating

that parking time has almost expired and asked whether the user wishes to extend

parking time should that be possible. The user can input a command by touching any

key indicating that parking time should be extended and the central control station will

deduct appropriate payment from the user's account and reactive the parking meter to

show that additional parking time has been paid for in [0052].

However, Amirpanahi discloses in col. 11, lines 30-42 that information about an

amount deposited and expiration time is stored in the mother board 12. After checking

balance of the prepaid parking card and checking a card identifying code entered by the

user, the mother board 12 determines whether the pointer 59 of the timer 6 should be

moved to indicate amount of parking time desired to be purchased by the user, and also

in col. 12, lines 32-56 shows that any unused amount of parking fee is added back to

the remaining, unused value of the parking charge card. It therefore would be obvious

to combine the teachings of Silberberg and Amirpanahi to disclose the following:

wherein said user makes said second payment before an expiry of time of said

first authorized parking time, and wherein the residual authorized parking time

corresponds to the time between the second payment and the expiry time of the first

authorized parking time/ wherein said user makes said second payment before an

expiry of time of said first authorized parking time, and wherein the residual authorized parking time corresponds to the time between the second payment and the expiry time of the first authorized parking time/ wherein the code of said first payment is valid until an expiry of time of said first authorized parking time, and wherein the residual authorized parking time corresponds to the time between said second payment and the expiry time of said first authorized parking time.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose the above limitations with the motivation of showing that a user can extend his parking time prior to the original parking time expiring.

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments filed 2/1/10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that in Silverberg, such all arrangement does not provide a code at the first payment, and thus the user can not extend their time whenever they want. To the extent that a "code" is provided it is at the time of the new payment call which is set by the system not by the user. Also, the second time is merely an additional block of time. It does not offer a hybrid second time with credit from not-yet-used/remainder first time. It thus does not automatically increase, by the payment system, the second authorized parking time by a residual authorized time corresponding to the first authorized parking time linked to the first payment identified by the received extending code as claimed in claim 1. However, Silverberg discloses that once payment

is made by user, the code is transmitted to the telephone of the user so the user can

text or call the station, in which the code is transmitted to the central station to allow

parking, as shown in [0059], lines 25-31-[0060], and therefore, the user is in control of

parking by making a new payment. Silverberg, also discloses that payment for the time

required can be deducted from the user's account in the same manner as described

with reference to Fig. 1, where in the embodiment of Fig. 1, payment is made in order to

extend parking time as shown in [0052], thereby suggesting that the code for a first

payment in paragraph [0059] can be used to extend parking time since the code is

directly related to payment, and payment is used to extend parking time, which makes

up for applicant's argument that Silverberg does not teach automatically increasing the

second authorized parking time by a residual authorized time corresponding to the first

authorized parking time linked to the first payment identified by the received extending

code.

Referring to the Amirpanahi patent, Applicant argues that the Examiner contends

that the information stored into the parking charge card can be considered as a code.

However, according to applicant, this is a refund code and not an extending code.

However, the present invention uses residual authorized time corresponding to an

extending code in order to increase parking time. Examiner interprets the refund code

of Amirpanahi as the code provided for residual time in the present invention since

residual time relates to the time left over for parking, and in Amirpanahi, the refund code

also relates to the time left over for parking.

Applicant further argues that if the user in Amirpanahi wants to extend the parking time whenever they want, it is necessary to insert their card, cancel, wait for the refund, and then perform a new transaction, where the present invention only requires that a second payment be made with the additional entering of the previously received extension code, and then automatically, the second parking time is increased. However, this is what happens in Amirpanahi. In Amirpanahi, it is disclosed in col. 12, lines 32-56 that upon reinsertion of the parking charge card into the magnetic strip reader the networked computerized parking system credits the parking charge card with the unused amount of parking fee, and identification information of the parking charge card is transferred to the central database computer 90 upon insertion of the parking charge card into the card insertion opening 68 so that any unused amount of parking fee is added back to the remaining, unused value of the parking charge card. In this case, although reinsertion of the parking charge card takes place, this reinsertion represents the second payment. Once the second payment is made, the identification information of the parking charge card, which examiner interprets as the code of the present invention, is used to increase the value on the parking charge card, thereby suggesting extending the parking time. This is obviously done automatically since it is the computerized parking system that credits the parking charge card with the unused amount of parking fee after the payment is made.

Conclusion

5.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Akiba K Robinson-Boyce whose telephone number is 571-272-6734. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9am-5:30pm.

       If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Hayes can be reached on 571-272-6708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the •Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system, Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

       Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

A. R. B.
May, 11 2010

/Akiba K Robinson-Boyce/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3628